

## REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of August 31, 2009, claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12-24, 27, 28 and 30-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,768,607 (“Drews et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,642,171 (“Baumgartner et al.”).

In response, Applicant has amended the independent claim 1 to include limitations of “*replaying said operations and said accompanying audio in said computer environment using an event recording, said operations resulting from processing of recorded user inputs of said event recording, said event recording including all user inputs to an original computer environment during said event recording and initial conditions of said original computer environment when said event recording was initiated.*” which are disclosed in the cited references of Drews et al. and Baumgartner et al., as kindly suggested by the Examiner on page 2 of the Final Office Action. The independent claims 10, 19, 28, 37 and 39 were similarly amended. As amended, Applicant respectfully submits the independent claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 37 and 39 are not obvious over Drews et al. in view of Baumgartner et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims this drawing objection be 1-6, 9, 10, 12-24, 27, 28 and 30-40 be allowed.

Applicant respectfully requests a notice of allowance in view of the claim amendments and the remarks made herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Denny Jaeger

Date: February 1, 2010

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham  
Registration No. 43,654  
Telephone: (925) 249-1300